

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

	·					
SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.		
957/AS7 (731)	01/14/01	PETATOU	: 1	Andrew Continue to		

REVIN AC HANDR DATAS ANDREELER PLAIN ACREDITE PLAIN ACR YORKS N.Y. 16111

EXAMINER					
PAPER NUMBER					
19					

e Lazzar

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application,

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

		Mar 1:1757
This applica	ation has been examined Responsive to communication filed on 2/87	This action is made final.
A shortened state	tutory period for response to this action is set to expire $\frac{J}{month(s)}$, $\frac{J}{month(s)}$ days from the and within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 13	
L Notice	E FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION: ce of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. ce of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449 fraction on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474 6.	Application, Form PTO-152
Part II SUMM	MARY OF ACTION	
1. [X Claim	ms 42-48 and 86-140	are pending in the application.
	Of the above, claims	are withdrawn from consideration.
2. 🔣 Clain	ns_/-41 and 49-85	have been cancelled.
3. Claim	ns	are allowed.
4. 🄀 Claim	ns 42-48 and 86-140	are rejected.
5. Claim	ns	are objected to.
6. Claim	ns are subject to res	triction or election requirement.
7. This matte	application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes u er is indicated.	ntil such time as allowable subject
8. Allow	vable subject matter having been indicated, formal drawings are required in response to this Office	action.
	corrected or substitute drawings have been received on These drawing not acceptable (see explanation).	s are [] acceptable;
10. [] The has ()	proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawin have) been approved by the examiner. disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).	ngs, filed on
the Pa	proposed drawing correction, filed	to ensure that the drawings are
12. [] Ackno	owledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been	n received not been received
	peen filed in parent application, serial no; filed on;	
13. Since	this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as dance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.	to the merits is closed in
14 Other		

EXAMINER'S ACTION

PTOL-326 (Rev. 7 - 82)

Art Unit 123

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless-

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.
- (f) he did not himself invent the subject matter sought to be patented.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Art Unit 123

Claims 89-123 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (a), (b), (e) and (f) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103 as obvious over Lormeau et al. Patent '662, '758 and '770 for reasons of record.

The references discloses peparin fractions and compositions of the types claimed.

Applicant's arguments filed January 2, 1987 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Applicants' urging that Lormeau et als patents
deparin fractions are just fractions obtained by depolymerization of naturally occurring heplarin and that the instant compounds are synthetically prepared does not overcome this rejection. That the present compounds are synthetically prepared does not patentably distinguished them over the naturally occurring counterparts.

Applicants' also argue that characteristics of the present compounds and compositions produced unexpected results.

However, the presents claims do not set forth any distinctive characteristics or properties. Hence, the instant compounds and compounds are deemed to be anticipated hereby or obvious from the cited prior art.

Art Unit 123

Claims 42-48, 86, 87 and 124 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Szarek et al., Nair et al., the PCT French patent or the Kochetkov et al reference for reasons of record.

Applicants' remarks have been carefully considered but are not deemed to be persuasive.

The presents arguments have been rebutted in paper no. 10 and in the absence of evidence to the contrary the present process is deemed obvious in view of the cited prior art.

Claim 88 is again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Szarek et al., Nair et al, PCT French Patent and Kochetkow et al for the reasons stated above in combination with Touey et al and Certin et al for the reasons set forth above and in the last Office action.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). The practice of automatically extending the shortened statutory period an additional month upon the filing of a timely first response to a final rejection has been discontinued by the Office. See 1021 TMOG 35.

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 CFR 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

457931 Serial No.

123 Art Unit

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John W. Rollins, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 557-0364.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 557-3920.

ROLLINS:wdh

3/28/87

J. R. BROWN

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

ART UNIT 123